R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 808 RC 000 176

REPORT ON CONFERENCES ON SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN OF MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS.

BY- HUGHES, JOHN F.
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

PUB DATE SE P66 00

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.16 27P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CONFERENCES, *EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, *LEGISLATION, *MIGRANT CHILDREN, *MIGRANT EDUCATION, MIGRANT WORKERS, NEEDS, SECONDARY EDUCATION, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, OEO, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT TITLE 3, PL 98 10 TITLE 1,

REGIONAL CONFERENCES ON SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN WERE CONDUCTED BETWEEN JUNE 23 AND 30, 1966, IN WASHINGTON D.C., DENVER, AND SAN FRANCISCO. THE PURPOSE OF THE MEETINGS WAS TO DISCUSS THE PROVISIONS OF THE PENDING MIGRANT AMENDMENT TO TITLE I OF P.L. 89-10, THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AND ALTERNATE WAYS TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN UNDER TITLE I. INCLUDED ARE AN OVERVIEW OF TITLE I AND THE WORKING GUIDELINES OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT. ALSO DISCUSSED ARE PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN DEFINING MIGRANTS AND OBTAINING ACCURATE DATA ON THEIR NUMBERS, INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE MIGRANT PROGRAMS, SUGGESTIONS FOR STATE PROGRAMS, AND COORDINATION OF PROJECTS TO AVOID DUPLICATION. REPORTS ON CURRENT MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE INCLUDED FOR 28 STATES. (RB)

ED020808

Report on Conferences on Special Educational Programs for Migratory Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers Washington, D.C. - June 23-24 - Denver, Colorado - June 27-28 - San Francisco, California - June 29-30 1966

Regional conferences on Special Educational Programs for Migratory Children were conducted between June 23 and June 30 in Washington, D.C., Denver, Colorado, and San Francisco, California. The purpose of the meetings was to discuss the provisions of the pending migrant amendment to Title I of P.L. 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the alternative ways to develop programs for migratory children under Title I.

George Haney, Program Specialist, opened the meetings and greeted the conferees. Opening remarks at the Washington Conference were given by John Staehle, Director, Policy and Procedures Section. Mr. Staehle noted that a program for migratory children is a need which has been recognized for some time. He stressed the importance of State authority, a factor which was especially recognized in the regular Title I program. In some programs, such as migrant education, a Federal-State cooperative effort is necessary to achieve effectiveness. Dr. Lloyd Garrison, O.E. Regional Representative, making opening remarks in Denver, stressed that the amendment will offer the opportunity on both a regional and a National basis to do a job that has needed to be done for years.

John Hughes, Director, Division of Program Operations*, gave opening remarks in San Francisco. He noted that the amendment falls into the pattern of Title I, with the features of Sec. 205 of the Act applying equally to the amendment.

*Now Division of Compensatory Education

RC 000176

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Mr. Hughes also noted the remarkable acceptance that Title I has had throughout the Nation. The program has affected the spirit as well as the body of education. There has been a change in the attitude of our schools and educators, which means that those children who have been getting the least from educational programs will now get the most and that is what Title I is designed to do. He concluded his remarks by saying that as we keep our eye on the program, we must keep one point in mind, that the child is the object of the program and the aim is to make a substantial difference in the lives of these children and to give them the opportunity for success that other affluent middle class children accept as a birthright.

An Overview of Title I was given by Alpheus White, Chief, Area Desk #2. Mr. White cited Sec. 201 of P.L. 89-10 as specifying the intent of the Act and stated that the provisions of this section, which are the working guidelines of Title I, also apply to the Title I amendments. Mr. White outlined these provisions as follows:

1. Money must be concentrated to meet <u>special</u> educational needs, not general needs.
2. Projects must be of sufficient size, scope, and quality.
3. Projects must involve those educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools.
4. Projects must be evaluated.
5. Annual reports must be made.
6. Projects must be designed in cooperation with CAP's.
7. Projects must provide for dissemination of information.

The Provisions of the Pending Amendment were covered in each of the three conferences by Henry Pike, Education Division, Office of the General Counsel. Mr. Pike reported that it is hoped that the full committee report will be out by the end of the month. He observed that there will be no funds available until both the authorization and the appropriation are acted upon by Congress. There is also a lack of legislative history.

Mr. Pike reviewed the form of the amendment as it presently stands, stating that the amendment will superimpose an additional entitlement based unpon the Commissioner's estimate of the number of migratory children translated into full-time equivalency. Because of the broad nature and interlocking provisions of the bill, this entitlement is based upon a national average per pupil expenditure and heavy emphasis is placed on cooperative arrangements between States, especially those States within a migrant stream.

Both inter and intra-State migrants are to be counted for the purpose of allocating funds. The original amendment provided only for the counting of inter-State migrants. The bill also specifies that the children as well as the parents must be migratory. If the children are not migratory, then they will be covered under the regular Title I program.

Because the numbers of migratory workers can only be estimated on the basis of last year's figures and because these numbers will be likely to vary from area to area due to seasonal and growth variations, it is anticipated that only a partial allotment of 75% will be made initially, with the rest being allotted at a later date on the basis of more reliable data.

Sec. 205 states that the program is a State program, to be administered by the State, with the State submitting a plan for approval to U.S.O.E. The Office of Education will see that the necessary correlation of programs between States is achieved.

There is provision in Sec. 205c(2) for the Commissioner to step in and make special arrangements with other public or nonprofit private agencies if he determines that a State is unable or unwilling to conduct a program, or that it would result in more efficient and economic administration, or add substantially to the welfare or educational attainment of migratory children. Hopefully the State will initiate a satisfactory program and where there is difficulty in designing a program, the Office of Education will work with the State in refining a plan rather than relying on the veto. The primary concern is that the children are served.

In meeting the special educational needs of these children, there is a possibility of segregating them from the children in the regular school program and violating Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. In relation to this, Mr. Pike stressed that there will have to be both give and take -- meeting the needs of the children and complying with Title VI. An eye must be kept on both of these problems. We hope, said Mr. Pike, to lead to a discontinuance of separate treatment but, at the same time, it is recognized that separate treatment is, at times, necessary to meet special needs.

A uniform definition of a migrant child or migrant worker is useful for the purpose of estimating numbers of children. In directing a program at migrant

children, however, the State is not expected to segregate these children from those who do not meet the precise definition. This point was taken by Dr. James Mauch, Director, Programs Branch*, in a memorandum to the Migrant Task Force. "We should not stand in the schoolhouse door," the memo reads, "separating Cesar Martines who lives next door from Jesus Galindez who comes from a neighboring State, and say one may benefit and the other may not although both are characterized by these special educational needs...the definitional problem is important to State allotments and to the determination of where programs will be located, but not to the selection of children. The latter is based on the presence of special educational needs."

Handbook V defines a migrant child as one "whose parent is a migrant worker and who is within the age limits for which the local school district provides free public edccation". George Haney suggested that a definition that might be applicable is one that defines the child as one "whose parent or guardian is a migrant agricultural worker whose primary employment is in agriculture and who establishes for the purpose of such employment a temporary residence".

Mr. Pike suggested that in view of the lack of legislative history, it would seem that those children whose parents work in canneries should also be included in a definition. Mr. Pike is hopeful that a definition will be found in the committee report or in the floor debate.

Interstate Programs and projects were discussed by Dr. James Steffenson,** Assistant Chief, Administrative Instructional Support Branch, at the Washington conference. Dr. Steffenson noted that the program calls for efforts to

* Now Program Development Branch

**Now Senior Program Specialist, Program Development Branch

compensate for discontinuity in educational programs and thus necessitates cooperation within and among States. Interstate agreements may take the form of an informal agreement or a formal compact. Dr. Steffenson suggested three models:

1. There is an outward transfer with one State, probably the home base State, making arrangements with other States.

2. Two or more States mutually agree to contribute services or funds or facilities to solve a common problem.

3. Funds are in the hand of a given State or coordinating agency and arrangements are made with other States for carrying on a given project.

Dr. Steffenson stressed that the States must get to the point where they can say not only what State B is doing, but what they are doing in State B.

In Denver and San Francisco, Jack McIntosh, Director, Division of Compensatory Education, Texas Education Agency, suggested some ways by which cooperative projects may be developed. Mr. McIntosh began by stating the premise that migrant children have special educational problems that are different from the problems that other children have and thus it becomes impossible for individuals or individual States to provide the programs to meet their educational needs. Various cooperative efforts suggested by Mr. McIntosh were:

1. Agreements to reimburse the receiving State for carrying on certain types of projects if that State lacks sufficient funds.

2. Teams of twelve-month teachers who would be paid from funds in one State, but which may be utilized by other States during their peak periods.

3. Programs to develop program materials to be carried by the children or transmitted to the receiving school.

4. Clearing house of information for keeping records and data.

5. Educational programs on a quarter basis, so that a child could complete segments of a years program rather than one nine-month program.

6. Stipends to parents to keep their children at the homebase during the period of the educational program or for room and board for these children until the program is ended.

7. Institutes for teachers of migrant children.

8. Supplements to States to carry on the educational program of the homebase State.

9. Research and survey programs.

Mr. McIntosh also discussed programs involving transportation services, parental participation, work experience, and work-shop centers. Mr. Haney suggested that States should also be considering pre-school and inservice programs, parental counseling, medical and dental services, pupil identification, and evaluation.

Intrastate programs and projects were discussed by Dr. White who stated that the States should come up with well defined and carefully developed programs by looking at the total picture. The first step in developing a program is to assemble data on these children concerning where they are, when they came, how long they stay, how many there are, from where they come, what kinds of educational experiences they have had, and what their special educational needs are. It will be necessary to assess what is currently being done for migrant children through OEO, Title I, and State supported programs. Consideration should be given to involving parents in the program for children either as aides or to instruct them as to how they can help their child to study. Dr. White also encouraged the States to be aware of Public Health Programs, programs conducted by private groups, and programs conducted in other States. States

must consider how they will coordinate their programs with those under Title IIIB of the Economic Opportunity Act.

There will be great flexibility in determining ways to meet the special educational needs of these children, but in developing a program, Dr. White stressed that it will be necessary to consider all sources available.

The problem of securing accurate data on numbers of migratory children was discussed at the Washington conference by Dr. Kenneth Simon, Director, National Center for Educational Statistics. A tentative breakdown of estimated amounts for children of migratory workers under the proposed amendment was distributed to the conferees. Dr. Simon explained that two types of figures were used by the Department of Labor in this breakdown.

1. Mid-month employment of migratory workers. This would put most of the money into non homebase areas.

2. Interstate migrant referrals. These are mostly homebase people.

Estimates of the number of months migrants remained in a State plus the full-time equivalency based on the calendar year were also obtained. An estimate was then made on the number of children per worker and this estimate was .75. Dr. Simon noted that of the groups studied by the Labor Department, 25% were children under 16. It is possible, therefore, that this estimate of .75 per worker is somewhat high. These figures are, however, the most reliable and the best figures presently available on a national basis. New and more reliable data that may be used on a national basis will continually be sought.

Project Standards were discussed by David Phillips, Chief, Area Desk #1, at the Washington and Denver conferences. Mr. Phillips began by stating that programs approved under this amendment must be of sufficient size, scope and quality to give reasonable promise of success in meeting the educational needs of these migratory children. He then discussed several items which should be considered in developing a project including such things as food, clothing and health services, attendance service, language instruction, transmittal of records, and special education programs.

The State program should consider:

1. the coordination of individual projects,
2. the development of instructional materials and units of study,
3. interstate and intrastate communication on identification and movement of, and programs for migrant children,
4. enforcement of child labor and school attendance laws,
5. special attention to secondary school programs,
6. teacher training,
7. private school participation,
8. coordination with OEO programs,
9. dissemination within and between States,
10. compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,
11. construction of facilities only in those cases in which it can be demonstrated that such construction is necessary for the success of an activity designed to meet the needs of migratory children and where acceptable facilities are not available on a rental or lease basis,
12. program evaluation,

13. maintenance of effort - it is not expected that the States will maintain programs that prove ineffective just for the sake of maintenance of effort.

Coordination with other Title I projects was covered by Carol Gilson, Area Program Assistant, at the Washington and Denver conferences and by Rosemary George, Program Specialist, at the San Francisco conference.

Miss Gilson stressed that the amendment will in those States that have included migrants in their Title I programs create an extension to those programs. The amendment, thus, will not disallow the use of regular Title I funds for migrant programs, but will allow additional funds to be tagged for the special purpose of providing educational programs for these migratory children. Coordination of these two programs may take several forms.

1. It is expected that in developing a program, the State will examine what has previously been done for migratory children in the area, what is presently being done, and what still remains to be done.

2. A State may pay staff from both regular Title I funds and amendment funds for time spent respectively in the two programs. This is especially beneficial to States that have need of a teacher for migratory children for only a few months out of the year.

3. Equipment purchased under the regular Title I program and presently not being utilized may be used for a migrant program.

4. Migrant projects may be coordinated with on-going Title I projects in the form of such activities as:

   (a) taking field trips together,

   (b) participating in recreational and physical fitness programs together,

   (c) Participating in such expressionistic and developmental activities as art, music, and drama,

(d) receiving health examinations and medical attention where needed,

(e) receiving food, and personal services,

(f) utilizing library and tutoring services.

Miss Gilson noted that the range of possible coordinating activities between the two programs is great and that an added benefit is offered by giving the child an opportunity for contact with children native to the area.

Miss George emphasized that planning and development of programs must take place at many different levels. She listed several things to consider in this planning:

1. The child and his emotional personality, intellectual development and self-image,

2. The family and the child's immediate peer group, taking into account the ethnic, racial, cultural, social, and socio-economic background, and the stability of the family,

3. The neighborhood, its socio-economic and health conditions, and its relations with other neighborhoods,

4. The school and the classroom which the child attends, the general school population, the staff, teacher characteristics, and the expectations of the child,

5. Other agencies and institutions which might have an effect on the child such as community and health centers, their personnel and decision-making organs,

6. The larger geographic and metropolitan area and the economic and political characteristics,

7. The international and national aspects, the social, political, and economic characteristics, and the educational philosophy.

Miss George emphasized that any program that fails to take the other levels of influence into consideration will not have the impact that it might. The State

should, therefore, marshal all resources available to help these children.

The topic of coordination activities with Office of Economic Opportunity Programs was discussed in Washington by Miss Beatrice McConnell, OEO consultant, and in Denver by Mr. Norman DeWeaver of the OEO Migrant Branch, Washington office.

Miss McConnell reported that OEO anticipates a phasing out of its educational programs under Title III B in light of the proposed amendment to Title I of P.L. 89-10. She also reported that Mr. Thomas Carter of the Office is of the opinion that it will not be possible for Title III B funds to carry educational programs during the interim period between the time the OEO grant period has been made for this year and the time that the new education funds under the proposed amendment are available. This is necessary, said Miss McConnell, because it would otherwise tie up funds so that other programs could not proceed.

Title III B funds will continue to support daycare and adult education programs. There are four areas that Title III B funds are authorized to cover: daycare, education, housing, and sanitation. With the phasing of the education programs, emphasis is expected to switch to the other areas.

Mr. DeWeaver discussed several items which OEO found to be important in planning programs for migrant children.

1. Involve the migrants in the planning and administration of the program, in policy making, and in employment. When migrants know that a program is built to meet the educational needs as they see them, they are more likely to participate in the program.

2. Involve the parents in the program as aides. Often a parent

aide will reflect an attitude that would not occur to the professional and therefore would not be reflected in the program. This type of involvement will establish a liaison between the professional and the migrant population.

3. Daycare programs that cover the total period of absence while parents are in the field are important.

4. Stipends to be used as an incentive to attend school are especially important in areas where the child is legally free to work and should be partially compensatory, nearing what he could earn working in the field.

It was also suggested that growers should be involved in the planning because of the role that they can play in keeping the children out of the field and in the school.

In coordinating these activities, the State should contact the OEO migrant programs in the State and involve OEO people in the planning of the State program.

Special Educational needs of Migratory Children were discussed by Mr. Haney at all three conferences. These needs include:

1. Regular school attendance - getting the child to the school or the school to the child through transportation and other services.

2. Continuity in their educational programs - sequence in subject matter.

3. Provisions for transmittal of adequate transfer records - perhaps standardized records within a migrant stream.

4. Food, clothing, dental and medical services.

5. Language instruction for Spanish-speaking children - teams of bilingual teachers.

6. Psychological services to help migrant children feel welcome, wanted and appreciated.

7. Personal and vocational guidance.

8. Moral philosphy, sex education, and health education.

9. An opportunity for remedial instruction taught by remedial teachers - basic skills such as language arts, reading, computational skills and science.

10. Specially trained teachers who understand their history and cultural backgrounds - inservice education of teachers.

11. Family involvement - family employment, perhaps as aides.

12. Community involvement - local committees, welcoming committees

13. Home visits by teachers.

14. Cultural development projects - field trips, art, music, drama.

15. An economic incentive - stipends for older children.

16. Basic curricular materials which build upon the migrant child's experience.

17. An interest in education - an awareness of the importance of education.

Most all conferees expressed appreciation for the information presented at the conferences and expressed a desire to attend a follow-up conference for implementing the migrant amendment to P.L. 89-10.

August 1966

STATE REPORTS

Washington Conference

Delaware

Interest in programs for migrants developed in Delaware with the Council of Churches which provided a day care program. A Governor's Committee on Migrants was later formed and now Delaware has a variety of programs for migrants coming into the State. The programs include: elementary and nursery school, summer school, cultural enrichment, basic adult education, and an "Everybody's Birthday Party".

Delaware is also one of the five states cooperating with California in a study of how states may develop State leadership for improving educational opportunities of migrant children. Under this compact, Delaware is working at developing curriculum materials that are of particular significance for the ethnic groups found in the migrant stream. These include basic materials and materials which utilize the child's travel experiences. More effective methods in transfering records, inter-agency coordinating activities such as inservice education and information exchange, and interstate sharing of materials and books are also under study by Delaware.

Florida

Florida is presently planning to establish a data processing system for processing records of migratory pupils. This system will be tested on the elementary level in from 4 to 6 school systems in 4 or 5 eastcoast stream State school systems. The data from the homebase and stream schools will be processed electronically and reports will be provided to particular schools concerning attendance, pupil data, residence, and academic and testing information. These schools will be able to obtain data on potential enrollment and know when the children are coming, how many there will be, and where they have been. It will enable educational planning to take place in schools which have previously been frustrated in such planning because of lack of information concerning the migrant children. If funded, Florida hopes to begin this operation in September of '66.

Florida, too, is one of the five states cooperating with California in the Title V interstate effort to develop State leadership for improving migratory programs. They are designing a long term program of services for migratory children and for administrators and teachers, as well as developing curriculum materials.

Mr. Julian Morse, Coordinator of Migrant Education, Florida State Department of Education, reported on a conference recently held in Orlando, Florida.

Mr. Morse reported the conferees hope that the guidelines for the migrant amendment will allow program flexibility at the local level so that they may meet the needs of the migrant children in their district as they see them.

Mr. Morse also reported several other suggestions from the conference including the use of traveling consultants, mobile units, mobile radio and television and an interchange of teachers from North and South in programs for migratory children. The conference also supported stronger teaching through leadership at the State, county, and local levels, and through extension courses, inservice training, and utilization of migrants as consultants.

Another possibility Florida is considering is that of asking their local school superintendents to file a letter of intent by a specified date, indicating if they have migrants in their district and if they plan to participate in the program under this amendment.

Florida has also had migrant programs funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity. Dade county has an OEO program for migrant children which includes such services as portable buildings, school social workers and psychiatrists, cardboard books, and field trips.

Georgia

Georgia's migrants are distributed widely. They have had no organized migrant programs, but are ready to work with the Office of Education in this endeavor.

Maryland

The Maryland Council of Churches established one of the first migrant programs in the country in this State. Vocational education programs have been set up offering instruction in barbering and auto mechanics. In Maryland the county rather than the State has taken the leadership in conducting programs for migrants. The State has, however, enforced school attendance laws and visited migrant camps to talk with the migrant parents.

Minnesota

Migrants spend an average of four to six weeks in Minnesota and this is mainly in the summer months. Consequently, there have not been education programs for migrants conducted in the public schools, since it is difficult to develop a meaningful education program for such a short period of time. Programs, therefore, have been mostly of an informational nature.

The first OEO program in Minnesota was funded last year. There are now eight centers operating elementary, child day care and development, and adult programs.

Mississippi

Although the Mississippi State Department of Education has had no formal migrant education program, they have attempted to reach some of their migrants through the Title I program.

New Jersey

This coming year New Jersey will have seven migrant centers. The emphasis has been upon the elementary grades in the past, but the State is now looking to the teenagers and discussing programs in pre-vocational skills and basic adult education. In their summer programs, New Jersey has drawn from the college population in seeking teacher aides. The State Department of Health, providing medical, dental, and health services, is another resource that New Jersey has utilized in its migrant program.

New York

New York's program for migratory children began in 1956 with two Pilot Programs. This expanded to 26 school districts involving 1,600 children last summer and to 30 school districts involving close to 3,000 children this summer. A workshop was held in the spring at the University of New York State for planning this summer's program. Evaluation conferences are planned for this fall.

New York is working with curriculum development in the area of reading and is attempting to capitalize on the unique aspects of the migrant child's society as he sees it in teaching him reading.

The representative from New York emphasized that, in the program for migratory children which is anticipated under pending legislation, emphasis must be placed upon local initiative with a minimum of State and Federal control.

North Carolina

Last year an OEO grant to the Council of Churches supported migrant summer schools in eastern North Carolina. These programs were essentially daycare programs. In the fall teachers were alloted to administrative units and migrant children were moved into the regular system and given instruction along with the resident students in grade 1 through high school.

Ohio

Each year more than 7,000 school age children of migrant farm workers, 94% of whom are based in Texas, spend from one to five months in northwestern Ohio. The children begin to enroll in the schools in late April and early May. In June the families move to Michigan to pick cherries. They return to Ohio in July and stay through September to harvest pickles and tomatoes.

Migrant programs were initiated in Ohio in 1958 and 1959 with Pilot summer schools supported by the Elizabeth S. Magee Education and Research Foundation and the United Church Women of Ohio.

Ohio has submitted a proposal to the Bureau of Research for establishing a pilot project to assess existing instructional programs and teaching materials to develop improved programs and materials to meet the needs of migratory children. The contracting agency for this project is the Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instructions, Inc. (MPATI). Ohio views the agency as being of key importance in the proposal since the "application of television to instruction and the advent of videotape recordings now make it possible to develop materials which can serve as concrete referents in critical assessments of educational practices." Moreover, the unique region-wide broadcast facilities of MPATI make available a technology capable of providing a high degree of continuity for mobile populations of students. If this program is initiated, "a family may move over a given weekend from one end of Illinois to the other end of Ohio, but when the children go to school on Monday they will find the television set in the classroom presenting the next lesson in first grade phonics by the same capable TV teacher whom they viewed on Friday".

Another field Ohio is working in is guidance and testing. They are attempting to develop a reliable testing program for migrants, but are running into difficulty because of language barriers.

Ohio faces another problem in implementing its migrant programs, that of getting the communities to participate. They are now operating an extensive and active public relations program to combat this lethargy. In northern Ohio, however, they are faced with ultraconservatives who did not wish to participate in the Title I program last year.

In an interstate cooperative effort, Texas has placed two men in the Ohio State Department of Education to work side by side this summer with Mr. Robert Wood, Supervisor of the State Migrant Education Program, observing the Ohio program and making suggestions. Another State Ohio believes it must work with is Michigan. In such a cooperative effort, an interstate agency could be set up to develop curriculum materials and study common problems.

Pennsylvania

Potter and Adams county, the only two areas in the State with a heavy concentration of migrants, conducted remedial and arts and crafts projects as a part of their migrant program. In other parts of the State the migrants are absorbed into the regular classroom or into Title I programs. Pennsylvania has a bureau in the State Department of Public Instruction that maintains responsibility for migrant education.

Under OEO a migrant committee was formed and consequently established a migrant community center to provide basic skill instruction for the migrants to make them more employable. Cultural enrichment, citizenship instruction, adult education, sanitation, and health services are offered to all migrants coming into the area. OEO has another program in Kennett Square, Pennsylvania to build new homes for migrant families. In Adams County the growers initiated an education program including Head Start and Adult Education components.

Virginia

Virginia at this time conducts no programs for migratory children.

Denver Conference

Colorado

The Colorado State Department of Education began a program of special summer schools for migrant children in 1955. In 1957 the Department undertook a Cooperative Research Project to find more effective ways of meeting the educational needs of migrant children. The study led to the passage of the State Migrant Children Educational Act in 1961, which provided for special schools for migrant children in the summer, and for a program of financial aid and consultation on curriculum and instruction for school districts receiving migrant children in the regular school year. The Act also extended the State compulsory attendance law to migrant children, and provided for the reimbursement by the State of additional, necessary costs involved in enforcing attendance, handling increased class loads, and meeting special educational needs.

Over twenty public and private agencies have cooperated with the State Department of Education to make the summer schools a success. OEO has supported day care centers and after-school recreation programs. There are four OEO centers for 1,000 children in Wells county, as well as an educational television project.

Before a migrant school is opened, a three person team is sent out to survey the area and distribute used clothing. Where the migrants are located is indicated on a master map with colored pins and this is used in making bus routes.

Colorado believes that migrant children are not deprived in willingness to learn, but in opportunity to learn. Program activities include field trips to show Spanish-American people working in other jobs besides that of the picker, recreational and physical fitness programs to help overcome the fatalistic attitude of the migrant child, a lunch program where the child is asked to pay 10¢ so that he may contribute a share, health kits and friendship boxes to welcome the children to the community (in the future the migrant children will be making friendship boxes for other children -- the children in Vietnam), an end-of-day salute to the flag, and an end-of-season show to which the parents are invited.

In their programs Colorado is attempting to meet the problem of a decreasing need for seasonal farm workers due to increasing mechinization. Farm labor is increasingly demanding technical skills, critical thinking, and a dependable nature -- characteristics that the present migrant agricultural worker does not have.

Illinois

In the past migrant children in Illinois have participated in educational programs with the regular school children, with funds coming from the State Aid Program. Last year the Illinois Office of Public Instruction developed guides for the education of migrant children.

Indiana

The majority of Indiana's migrants come from the Rio Grande area in Texas. The peak number of children arrive in September and jam the schools. Among the migrants are approximately 1,000 Negroes and 1,200 non-Spanish whites. The Negro migrants bring no dependents.

The migrant children are absorbed into the regular classroom situation and much of the work done specifically with the migrants is done by voluntary groups. The migrants leave Indiana around mid-October.

Kansas

Most of the Kansas migrants are found in the western part of the State. Kansas is meeting some of their needs under Title I in regular school and summer programs. There are also some OEO programs being conducted in the State. Kansas plans to conduct a survey among the local school superintendents to ascertain the numbers of migrant children throughout their State.

Michigan

Forty-seven percent of Michigan's migrants are from out-of-State. Seventy-five percent of these come from Texas. Michigan has participated in many cooperative efforts in the last 10 to 15 years. Participating in this effort have been the migrant ministry, Farm Labor Management Committee, Citizen Council of Agricultural Labor and the Michigan Migrant Opportunity, Inc. (MMOI). Last year a Governor's Commission on Migratory Labor was established by the governor to develop a program of action primarily in the field of education.

Day care programs have sprung up all over the State. They are primarily supported by local agencies and the MMOI. A bill has recently been passed in Michigan which allows the State to sponsor pre-school programs.

There are many opportunities in Michigan for effective interstate cooperation. Migrants usually come into Michigan for three to four weeks in the summer or fall. Many of these migrants come from Texas where academics are emphasized

in the six-month program and with the many State parks and lakes, opportunities are numerous in Michigan for recreational activities. There are opportunities for physical fitness programs, field trips, science, math and other teachings that can be tied in with the field trips. All of these activities could, thus, supplement the academic program offered the children in Texas if the two State programs are coordinated. Two people from the Texas Education Agency have been assigned to the Michigan State Department of Public Instruction this summer in a cooperative effort.

North Dakota

The Governor's Migratory Labor Committee has worked as a voluntary group to improve the home conditions of migrants. Although no programs as yet have been set up in North Dakota under OEO, it is anticipated that some programs for migrants will be established in the future.

Oklahoma

Oklahoma is presently in a transitional period between being an agricultural State and becoming an industrial State. Approximately 5,000 migrants come into the State each year for the cotton harvest. Their problem is not as great with migrant workers, however, as with the seasonal workers. Oklahoma is seeking to improve the social conditions of the migrant so that the child's education will be reinforced by his social surroundings. OEO programs will serve in this respect to supplement educational programs established for migratory children under the pending legislation. OEO presently is conducting several recreational and daycare programs in the State.

Oklahoma has an Interagency Coordinating Council which meets once a month to exchange ideas and to coordinate State efforts.

Texas

In 1962 The Texas State Board of Education requested a survey to determine the number of migratory children and their migration patterns. As a result of this survey, on January 7, 1963 the State Board of Education approved the appointment of a commission to consider more effective ways of educating migrant children. The commission proposed a six-month school program with a longer daily schedule and fewer holidays designed to provide the same number of instructional hours required in the nine-month program. The program was initiated in five schools, with 3,000 students participating in September, 1963.

There were forty participating schools with an enrollment of 20,000 students in 1965-66. The greatest concentration of schools is in the Rio Grande Valley, the home base of the largest migrant stream. The schools have been financially supported by the Minimum Foundation Program and through OEO grants.

The written evaluation on the first year operation was quite satisfying. There was a notable change in attitude of the children toward school. They developed a feeling of belonging and success. This change in attitude was demonstrated in one Texas Jr. High migrant school when the students decided to follow suit with the Jr. High school in the district and have a Tacky Day, dressing up in tacky clothes. Some of the migrants blacked one eye and wrote on the backs of their shirts -- "we migrants would rather fight than switch". This example was cited to dispel the feeling of some that migrant children should always be integrated into the regular school classrooms. Often the child's special needs are neglected when he is put full-time into the regular school system.

This summer Texas has sent twelve teams of teachers into State Departments of Education in twelve states in an effort to gather ideas and information for designing interstate cooperative agreements. Texas has previously cooperated with Colorado and Oregon in a pre-school program. In adult education, Texas has had a program supported by OEO which may be coordinated with the educational programs for children.

Two six-week institutes for teachers of migratory children are being held this summer at the Pan American College at Edinburg and at A & I at Kingsville. Approximately 120 teachers are involved in the institute which is designed to better orient teachers as to what is attempting to be done in the migrant program.

Wisconsin

An average of 12 thousand migrants come into Wisconsin each year. Title I has taken over most migrant programs concerned with education and several communities have tried to integrate the migrant children into the regular school year and summer programs. Sporadic attendance is a problem in all programs, however. The State, when funds are available, anticipates utilizing the mobile school in its migrant program.

A Migrant Committee, established in 1950, is concerned with minimum housing standards, labor standards, health, and education standards for migrants.

San Francisco Conference*

Arizona

Arizona faces a problem each year when its small schools with less than 100 enrollment at the beginning of the year mushrooms to over 200 with the inflow of migrants. OEO and Title I funds are being used to support educational programs for migrant children. The State does not have a separate migrant program.

Many of Arizona's migrants are in transition from Texas to California. There are some intrastate migrants, but they are getting fewer.

One problem faced by Arizona schools is in the attendance of migrant children. Every third day at least one child is absent for baby sitting.

California

Some work has been done with migrants in California in the summers, teaching them English. There are OEO Title III B and II A programs presently in effect in the State in day care, health and housing programs, and programs in compensatory education for special problem children.

California has drawn up a plan for the education of migrant children and is prepared to submit it to the Office of Education when the legislation is authorized. In preparing this plan, regional meetings were held to gather data on living conditions of migrants from Farm Labor and Health Services, to gather welfare data and information on what is presently being done for migrants and to apply this information to ideas presented at the meeting. The program is being developed as a State program with component projects. A staff of two is developing an original structure for the State with a modular structure for the 60 units including preschool, regular school, adult, vocational and practical education. The interstate component consists of record transfer. The plan provides for health, food, personal, and guidance services.

A planning committee is being set up for establishing a teacher corps in schools with high concentrations of migrants, providing for inservice education and for working with the school administration and in the clearing up of personnel qualifications. The plan calls for the migrant children to be integrated into the regular classroom with special instruction either during a given period within the regular school time or after school. Some programs may concentrate fully on the migrant children outside the regular classroom and then integrate them into the regular classroom as soon as possible.

This plan will not replace existing programs but will redirect those programs into the plan. It is a $60,000 program which includes all components - Title I, OEO, State assistance, etc.

Idaho

In early April, Idaho receives approximately 9,000 migrants, the majority coming from Texas. Most stay throughout June. Funds under Titles IIA and IIIB of the Economic Opportunity Act and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are being used to operate programs for migratory children, including Head Start and day care programs.

Montana

OEO has funded programs for migrants under Title II A of the Economic Opportunity Act. Programs recently funded have been education programs. OEO Program Developer Aides have recently conducted a survey to locate the migrants in the State and have submitted the survey to the Department of Labor. OEO has made the State and the schools aware of the needs and the problems of migrants.

New Mexico

Potato pickers migrating from the Hereford School District in Texas into New Mexico are a cause of problems for this State in the education of migrant children. The children come into New Mexico still speaking Spanish. Title I money has been used in this area in the past year for remedial reading and language arts programs to combat this problem.

Intrastate migrants are found among the Indian population in Magdalena, where portable classrooms move from one group to another and migratory pets come to school with the migratory children.

New Mexico reports that as tradition is broken, something will be done for the migrant child -- "Poco a Poco" -- little by little.

Oregon

Oregon has been dealing with the migrant problem for ten years. Twelve of the thirty-six counties in Oregon now have programs for migrants. The State has in the past sponsored summer schools for migrants by contracting with the local educational agencies and the Council of Churches has also sponsored programs for migrants. Five types of programs are conducted for migrants in

Oregon: regular school, pre-school, summer school, daycare, and remedial.

Approximately 90% of Oregon's migrants come from Texas. Oregon also gets migrants from Arizona, California and Idaho.

Washington

Ninety percent of Washington's migrants come from Texas. Several programs have been set up for the migrants under OEO. Daycare centers have been established in mobile buildings, Community Action Programs operate some migrate projects and a survey team has been financed through OEO. The team has been concerned with determining the children's needs, the inadequacies of their education, adult needs for basic education, labor standards as they affect migrants, and legislative needs. At the end of the survey, they hope to be able to ascertain what State legislation is needed to bolster the program.

Title I has funded Teacher Training Workshops in Washington covering bilingual teachings and the psychological and sociological problems involved in bilingual teaching.

* Texas was also represented at the San Francisco Conference.